

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 MARQUIS BARBER,

13 Defendant.
14

Case No. CR20-057-RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION
FOR EARLY
TERMINATION OF
SUPERVISED RELEASE

15 This matter comes before the Court on defendant's "Motion for Early Termination of
16 Supervised Release." (Dkt. # 4).

17 On August 7, 2014, defendant pleaded guilty to conspiracy to commit sex trafficking of
18 children, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1594(c). Dkt. # 2 at 11. The U.S. District Court for the
19 Southern District of California sentenced defendant to 72 months of imprisonment and ten years
20 of supervised release. Dkt. # 2 at 34-35. This Court accepted jurisdiction over defendant on
21 April 16, 2020. Dkt. # 1. According to his supervising Probation Officer, defendant started his
22 term of supervised release on July 30, 2019. Dkt. # 4 at 2.

23 The Court may "after considering the factors set forth in [18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)] . . .
24 terminate a term of supervised release and discharge the defendant released at any time after the
25 expiration of one year of supervised release . . . if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by
26 the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice." 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e). The
27 Court enjoys "discretion to consider a wide range of circumstances when determining whether
28

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR EARLY
TERMINATION OF SUPERVISED RELEASE - 1

1 to grant early termination.” United States v. Emmett, 749 F.3d 817, 819 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing
2 United States v. Pregent, 190 F.3d 279, 283 (4th Cir. 1999)).

3 The Court is pleased to learn that defendant is doing well under supervised release and
4 commends defendant’s progress, including his stable employment and dedication to his masonry
5 apprenticeship. Considering, however, the nature of defendant’s sex trafficking offense and that
6 defendant has served less than a quarter of his ten-year term of supervised release, the Court
7 finds that it would be premature to terminate his term of supervised release. See 18 U.S.C.
8 §§ 3583(e)(1), 3553(a). Accordingly, defendant’s request for early termination of supervised
9 release (Dkt. # 4) is DENIED. The Court supports allowing defendant to travel outside of
10 Washington State for work-related reasons so long as defendant obtains prior approval of his
11 United States Probation Officer, and the Court is amenable to amending the terms of his
12 supervised release to reflect this.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14
15 DATED this 29th day of November, 2021.

16
17
18 

19 Robert S. Lasnik
20 United States District Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28